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**Ramsar COP13 National Report Format (NRF)**

**Background information**

1. The COP13 National Report Format (NRF) has been approved by the Standing Committee 52 for the Ramsar Convention’s Contracting Parties to complete as their national reporting to the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties of the Convention (United Arab Emirates, 2018).
2. The Standing Committee through Decision SC52-07 has also **agreed that an online National Reporting format could be made available to Parties by keeping the off-line system and requested the Secretariat to present an evaluation for the next COP regarding the use of the on-line system.**

3. The National Report Format is being issued by the Secretariat in 2016 to facilitate Contracting Parties’ implementation planning and preparations for completing the Report. The deadline for submission of national targets is by 30 November 2016 and the deadline for submission of completed National Reports is January 21st **2018.**

4. Following Standing Committee discussions, this COP13 NRF closely follows that of the NRF used for COP12, to permit continuity of reporting and analysis of implementation progress by ensuring that indicator questions are as far as possible consistent with previous NRFs (and especially the COP12 NRF). It is also structured in terms of the Goals and Strategies of the 2016-2024 Ramsar Strategic Plan adopted at COP12 as Resolution XII.2.

5. This COP13 NRF includes 92 indicator questions. In addition, Section 4 is provided as an optional Annex in order to facilitate the task of preparing the Party’s National Targets and Actions for the implementation of each of the targets of the Strategic Plan 2016-2024 according to Resolution XII.2.

6. As was the case for previous NRF, the COP13 Format includes an optional section (Section 5) to permit a Contracting Party to provide additional information, on indicators relevant to each individual Wetland of International Importance (Ramsar Site) within its territory.

7. Note that, for the purposes of this national reporting to the Ramsar Convention, the scope of the term “wetland” is that of the Convention text, i.e. all inland wetlands (including lakes and rivers), all nearshore coastal wetlands (including tidal marshes, mangroves and coral reefs) and human-made wetlands (e.g. rice paddy and reservoirs), even if a national definition of “wetland” may differ from that adopted by the Contracting Parties to the Ramsar Convention.

**The purposes and uses of national reporting to the Conference of the Contracting Parties**

8. National Reports from Contracting Parties are official documents of the Convention and are made publicly available on the Convention’s website.

9. There are seven main purposes for the Convention’s National Reports. These are to:

1. provide data and information on how, and to what extent, the Convention is being implemented
2. provide tools for countries for their national planning

iii) capture lessons and experience to help Parties plan future action;

iv) identify emerging issues and implementation challenges faced by Parties that may require further attention from the Conference of the Parties;

v) provide a means for Parties to account for their commitments under the Convention;

vi) provide each Party with a tool to help it assess and monitor its progress in implementing the Convention, and to plan its future priorities; and

vii) provide an opportunity for Parties to draw attention to their achievements during the triennium.

10. The data and information provided by Parties in their National Reports have another valuable purpose as well, since a number of the indicators in the National Reports on Parties’ implementation provide key sources of information for the analysis and assessment of the “ecological outcome-oriented indicators of effectiveness of the implementation of the Convention”.

11. To facilitate the analysis and subsequent use of the data and information provided by Contracting Parties in their National Reports, the Ramsar Secretariat holds in a database all the information it has received and verified. The COP13 reports will be in an online National Reporting system.

12. The Convention’s National Reports are used in a number of ways. These include:

1. providing an opportunity to compile and analyze information that contracting parties can use to inform their national planning and programming.

ii) providing the basis for reporting by the Secretariat to each meeting of the Conference of the Parties on the global, national and regional implementation, and the progress in implementation, of the Convention. This is provided to Parties at the COP as a series of Information Papers, including:

* the Report of the Secretary General on the implementation of the Convention at the global level;
* the Report of the Secretary General pursuant to Article 8.2 (b), (c), and (d) concerning the List of Wetlands of International Importance); and
* the reports providing regional overviews of the implementation of the Convention and its Strategic Plan in each Ramsar region;

iii) providing information on specific implementation issues in support of the provision of advice and decisions by Parties at the COP.

iv) providing the source data for time-series assessments of progress on specific aspects in the implementation of the Convention included in other Convention products. An example is the summary of progress since COP3 (Regina, 1997) in the development of National Wetland Policies, included as Table 1 in Ramsar Wise Use Handbook 2 (4th edition, 2010); and

v) providing information for reporting to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) on the national implementation of the CBD/Ramsar Joint Work Plan and the Ramsar Convention’s lead implementation role on wetlands for the CBD. In particular, the Ramsar Secretariat and STRP used the COP10 NRF indicators extensively in 2009 to prepare contributions to the in-depth review of the CBD programme of work on the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems for consideration by CBD SBSTTA14 and COP10 during 2010 (see UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/14/3). Similar use of COP12 NRF indicators is anticipated for the CBD’s next such in-depth review.

# The structure of the COP13 National Report Format

13. The COP13 National Report Format (NRF) is in five sections:

**Section 1** provides the institutional information about the Administrative Authority and National Focal Points for the national implementation of the Convention.

**Section 2** is a ‘free-text’ section in which the Party is invited to provide a summary of various aspects of national implementation progress and recommendations for the future.

**Section 3** provides the 92 implementation indicator questions, grouped under each Convention implementation Goals and Targets in the Strategic Plan 2016-2024, and with an optional ‘free-text’ section under each indicator question in which the Contracting Party may, if it wishes, add further information on national implementation of that activity.

**Section 4** is an optional annex to allow any Contracting Party that has developed national targets to provide information on the targets and actions for the implementation of each of the targets of the Strategic Plan 2016-2024.

In line with Resolution XII.2, which encourages Contracting Parties “to develop and submit to the Secretariat on or before December 2016, and according to their national priorities, capabilities and resources, their own quantifiable and time-bound national and regional targets in line with the targets set in the Strategic Plan”, all Parties are encouraged to consider using this comprehensive national planning tool as soon as possible, in order to identify the areas of highest priority for action and the relevant national targets and actions for each target.

The planning of national targets offers, for each of them, the possibility of indicating the *national priority* for that area of activity as well as the *level of resourcing available*, *or that could be made available during the triennium, for its implementation*. In addition, there are specific boxes to indicate the *National Targets* for implementation by 2018 and the *planned national activities* that are designed to deliver these targets.

Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016-2024 shows the synergies between CBD Aichi Biodiversity Targets and Ramsar Targets. Therefore, the NRF provide an opportunity that Contracting Parties indicate as appropriate how the actions they undertake for the implementation of the Ramsar Convention contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets according to paragraph 51 of Resolution XII.3.

**Section 5** is an optional annex to allow any Contracting Party that so wishes to provide additional information regarding any or all of its Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Sites).

# General guidance for completing and submitting the COP13 National Report Format

Important – please read this guidance section before starting to complete the National Report format

14.All Sections of the COP13 NRF should be completed in one of the Convention’s official languages (English, French, Spanish).

1. The deadline for submission of the completed NRF is January 21st **2018**. It will not be possible to include information from National Reports received after that date in the analysis and reporting on Convention implementation to COP13.

16. The deadline for submission of national targets is by 30 November 2016

17. All fields with a pale yellow background must be filled in.

Fields with a pale green background are free-text fields in which to provide additional information, if the Contracting Party so wishes. Although providing information in these fields is optional, Contracting Parties are encouraged to provide such additional information wherever possible and relevant, as it helps us understand Parties’ progress and activity more fully, to prepare the best possible global and regional implementation reports to COP.

18. To help Contracting Parties refer to relevant information they provided in their National Report to COP12, for each appropriate indicator a cross-reference is provided to the equivalent indicator(s) in the COP12 NRF or previous NRF, shown thus: {x.x.x}

19. For follow up and where appropriate, a cross-reference is also provided to the relevant Key Result Area (KRA) relating to Contracting Parties implementation in the Strategic Plan 2009-2015.

20. Only Strategic Plan 2016-2024 Targets for which there are implementation actions for Contracting Parties are included in this reporting format; those targets of the Strategic Plan that do not refer directly to Parties are omitted (e.g. targets 6 and 14).

21. The Format is created as a form in Microsoft Word to collect the data. You will be able to enter replies and information in the yellow or green boxes.

For each of the ‘indicator questions’ in Section 3, a legend of answer options is provided. These vary between indicators, depending on the question, but are generally of the form: ‘A - Yes’, ‘B - No’, ‘C - Partially’, ‘D - In progress’. This is necessary so that statistical comparisons can be made of the replies. Please indicate the relevant letter (A, B etc.) in the yellow field.

For each indicator question you can choose only one answer. If you wish to provide further information or clarification, do so in the green additional information box below the relevant indicator question. Please be as concise as possible (**maximum of 500 words** in each free-text box).

1. In Section 4 (Optional) for each target the planning of national targets section looks as follows (in the example of Target 8 on inventory):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Planning of National Targets | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** | *[Example text]* To have comprehensive inventory of all wetlands by 2018 | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** | *[Example text]* To update the existing inventory so as to cover all the national territory, and to incorporate relevant information about wetlands, including digital information, when possible | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** | *[Example text] A comprehensive inventory of all wetlands* | |

The input has to be made only in the yellow boxes. For **Priority** and **resourcing**, the coded answers are given in the right part of the table *(*always in *italics)*. The answer chosen should be typed inside the yellow box at the left side of the coded options. **Targets** and **planned activities** are text boxes; here, Contracting Parties are invited to provide more detailed information in the respective box on their National Targets for achievement in implementation by 2018 and the planned national activities that are designed to deliver these targets.

***Please note that only ONE coded option –the one that better represents the situation in the Contracting Party– should be chosen. Blanks will be coded in COP13 National Reports Database as “No answer”.***

1. The NRF should ideally be completed by the principal compiler in consultation with relevant colleagues in their agency and others within the government and, as appropriate, with NGOs and other stakeholders who might have fuller knowledge of aspects of the Party’s overall implementation of the Convention. The principal compiler can save the document at any point and return to it later to continue or to amend answers. Compilers should refer back to the National Report submitted for COP12 to ensure the continuity and consistency of information provided. In the online system there will be also an option to allow consultation with others.
2. After each session, **remember to save the file**. A recommended filename structure is: COP13NRF [Country] [date], for example: COP13NRFSpain13January 2018.doc
3. After the NRF has been completed using the word version (offline), please enter the data in the NR online system at this link: <https://reports.ramsar.org> or send it by email ([nationalreports@ramsar.org](mailto:nationalreports@ramsar.org)) by January 21st 2018. If you have any questions or problems, please contact the Ramsar Secretariat for advice at ([nationalreports@ramsar.org](mailto:nationalreports@ramsar.org)).
4. The completed NRF **must be accompanied by a letter that can be uploaded in the online system or send by email (**[**nationalreports@ramsar.org**](mailto:nationalreports@ramsar.org9)**) in the name of the Head of Administrative Authority, confirming that this is the Contracting Party’s official submission of its COP13 National Report**.

If you have any questions or problems, please contact the Ramsar Secretariat for advice ([nationalreports@ramsar.org](mailto:nationalreports@ramsar.org)).

National report to Ramsar COP13

# Section 1: Institutional Information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Important note: the responses below will be considered by the Ramsar Secretariat as the definitive list of your focal points, and will be used to update the information it holds. The Secretariat’s current information about your focal points is available at** [**http://www.ramsar.org/search-contact**](http://www.ramsar.org/search-contact)**.** | | |
| **Name of Contracting Party:** | |  |
|  | | |
| Designated Ramsar Administrative Authority | | |
| Name of Administrative Authority: | |  | | --- | | Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality | | |
| Head of Administrative Authority - name and title: | Drs. R. Feringa, Director of the Department Nature and Biodiversity, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality. | |
| Mailing address: | P.O. Box 20401, 2500 EK The Hague, the Netherlands | |
| Telephone/Fax: | +31 70 3785004 | |
| Email: | r.feringa@minez.nl | |
| Designated National Focal Pointfor Ramsar Convention Matters | | |
| Name and title: | Drs. A.J. Pel, Policy Officer | |
| Mailing address: | P.O. Box 20401, 2500 EK The Hague, the Netherlands | |
| Telephone/Fax: | 06-467 146 94 | |
| Email: | a.j.pel@minez.nl | |
| Designated National Focal Point for Matters Relating to The Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP) | | |
| Name and title: |  | |
| Name of organisation: | Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality | |
| Mailing address: | P.O. Box 20401, 2500 EK The Hague, The Netherlands | |
| Telephone/Fax: |  | |
| Email: |  | |
| Designated Government National Focal Point for Matters Relating to The Programme on Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness (CEPA) | | |
| Name and title: | Drs. A.J. Pel, Policy Officer | |
| Name of organisation: | Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality | |
| Mailing address: | P.O. Box 20401, 2500 EK The Hague, the Netherlands | |
| Telephone/Fax: | 06-467 146 94 | |
| Email: | a.j.pel@minez.nl | |
| Designated Non-Government National Focal Point for Matters Relating to The Programme on Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness (CEPA) | | |
| Name and title: | Vacant | |
| Name of organisation: |  | |
| Mailing address: |  | |
| Telephone/Fax: |  | |
| Email: |  | |

# Section 2: General summary of national implementation progress and challenges

**In your country, in the past triennium (i.e., since COP12 reporting):**

A. What have been the five most successful aspects of implementation of the Convention?

|  |
| --- |
| 1) The Spaans Lagoen Ramsar site on Aruba has been incorporated within the Arikok National Park in 2017 and will be included in its managementplan. Restoration measures have been carried out in 2016-2017 (<http://www.dcnanature.org/mangrove-restoration-spaans-lagoen/>). Additional new Ramsar site designations for Aruba are foreseen. |
| 2) Bonaire updated the RIS of its 5 Ramsar sites and has conducted preparatory work for a proposed merged Ramsar site Washington Slagbaai and Gotomeer in one larger Ramsar site, which also includes the Salinas (Salt-water lakes) of the Washington Slagbaai National Park. (So Bonaire will then have 4 Ramsar sites). |
| 3) The islands of Bonaire, St. Eustatius and Saba have become special municipalities of the Netherlands in 2010. The increased cooperation since, with local experts and scientists from the Netherlands (mostly funded by the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food quality , formerly known as Ministry of Economic Affairs) has greatly enhanced the knowledge and management of Caribbean wetlands. |
| 4) Bonaire is conducting a variety of projects to better the ecological integrity of its salinas and Ramsar sites. Projects include reforestation, countering invasive species, waste clean up, protection of sensitive areas, bettering water ciculation, prevention of sedimentation, outreach and communication etc. |
| 5) |

B. What have been the five greatest difficulties in implementing the Convention?

|  |
| --- |
| 1) Human induced threats: Major threats from eutrophication, sedimentation, invasive species (and also climate change) and disturbance cannot be solved at Ramsar site level but need (more) actions at island level. |
| 2) Wetland inventory data: Data for colony birds and sea turtle nests are readily available but in general wetland inventory data are lacking, which makes it difficult to observe trends and take (pro-active) management actions. |
| 3) Awareness raising: The small islands in the Caribbean face the problems that are typical for small island developing states. With their small area and small populations they have to deal with limited capacity, very few and limited resources, and no hinterland. Their economies are completely dependent on outside factors and in most cases tourism is the main driver of the economy. This results in a constant pressure to develop more area to accommodate more tourism and thus provide for economic growth. This is one of the greatest threats to the coastal (wetlands) ecosystems, the loss of which would eventually destroy tourism. Yet biodiversity conservation is generally perceived on the islands as being in conflict with economic development instead of being an integral factor for economic development. Consequently it is very difficult to argue the need to protect wetlands. However the fact that Bonaire did adopt zoning- and nature legislation that generally protects wetlands and coastal areas shows that the island understands its dependence on its nature resources. |
| 4) |
| 5) |

C. What are the five priorities for future implementation of the Convention?

|  |
| --- |
| 1) Caribbean Netherlands Priorities: implementation of management plans for all Ramsar sites, implementation of management actions like restoration of mangroves (Lac Bonaire; Spaans Lagoen Aruba; Mullet Pond St. Maarten), reforestation of Klein Bonaire, management of increasing visitor impacts (Lac and Klein Bonaire), eradication of free roaming livestock, species monitoring and updating of management plans. |
| 2) It is considered important that the Dutch Ramsar Sites in the Caribbean, five on Bonaire, four on Curacao, one on Aruba and one (potential site) on St. Maarten, be (also) integrated in the Caribbean database rather than the European database. To date these Dutch Caribbean sites are still not visible in the Caribbean part of the RSIS database (see <https://rsis.ramsar.org/ris-search/?f%5B0%5D=regionCountry_en_ss%3ALatin%20America%20and%20the%20Caribbean>) |
| 3) Participation from the Caribbean Netherlands in the Caribbean Wetlands Regional Initiative (CARIWET). |
| 4) Development of the follow-up of the Nature Policy Plan Caribbean Netherlands 2013-2017, including actions in line with the Ramsar Convention. |
| 5) Designation of new Ramsar sites at the island of Aruba and expansion of sites on Bonaire, particularly in the Washington Slagbaai area and possibly the southern wetlands where the Pekelmeer Ramsar site is situated. |

D. Do you (AA) have any recommendations concerning implementation assistance from the Ramsar Secretariat?

|  |
| --- |
| For the Caribbean Netherlands as well as for Aruba, Curaçao and St. Maarten, the Caribbean Wetlands Initiative is felt to be important and it is recommended that this initiative be facilitated by the Secretariat as much as possible. |

E. Do you (AA) have any recommendations concerning implementation assistance from the Convention’s International Organisation Partners (IOPs)? (including ongoing partnerships and partnerships to develop)

|  |
| --- |
| Birdlife International's Dutch partner, Vogelbescherming Nederland, has developed a support program for the Dutch Caribbean Nature Alliance (DCNA) the umbrella organization for the protected areas management organizations of all six Dutch islands in the Caribbean. This support strengthened DCNA, an important partner for nature conservation in the islands, and led to several bird monitoring training workshops in the Dutch Caribbean, providing important capacity building for conservation of wetlands. |

F. How can national implementation of the Ramsar Convention be better linked with implementation of other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), especially those in the ‘biodiversity cluster’ (Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), World Heritage Convention (WHC), and United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)?

|  |
| --- |
| SPAW Protocol: The SPAW Protocol is the main regional instrument to implement the CBD and protection of wetlands (mangroves, coral reefs, sea grasses, coastal nature conservation) is an important part of its work. SPAW has an Memorandum of Cooperation with the Ramsar Convention. Mutual participation in meetings is satisfactory.  IAC: The inter-American Sea Turtle Convention shares many common goals with Ramsar in the protection of wetlands since sea turtle nesting beaches and foraging areas are all located in wetlands. The Lac Ramsar site on Bonaire has been identified as a very important foraging area for sea turtles that grow faster there than anywhere else in the Caribbean. Protection of sea turtles in Lac goes hand in hand with the protection of the seagrasses of this wetland area. A Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC) between the Ramsar Caribbean Wetlands Initiative and IAC was signed in 2012.  CITES: Conch (*Strombus gigas*) is listed on appendix II of CITES and is an important fishery target species. Wetlands with seagrasses are very important to these shellfish and sustainable use of conch is dependent on protection of these wetlands. The conch restoration project 2010-2013 in the Lac Ramsar Site did not only look at these shellfish but also at the seagrass beds they feed on. The population of Conch on the Saba Bank and around St. Eustatius is regarded sufficiently healthy to allow sustainable harvesting[[1]](#footnote-1).  WHMSI: The Western Hemisphere Migratory Species Initiative is an informal platform of countries in the Western Hemisphere to cooperate in the protection of migratory species. As many migratory species are dependent on wetlands there is natural overlap of the objectives of WHMSI and Ramsar. Ramsar has a seat in the Steering Committee of WHMSI and we are satisfied with this cooperation. A draft resolution for CMS COP 10 includes inter alia a close partnership between the CMS and WHMSI and requests the development of an Action Plan.  ICRI: The Caribbean Netherlands are an important coral reef area and participate in the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI). The Klein Bonaire Ramsar Site includes some of the most pristine coral reefs of Bonaire. The Caribbean Netherlands hosted a joint ICRI Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN) and SPAW workshop to revitalize monitoring of coral reefs in the Caribbean, on Curacao in August of 2014 and an ICRI Environmental Economics Workshop in September 2014 on Bonaire.  WHC: Bonaire and Curacao are working towards a World Heritage nomination that combines the Bonaire National Marine Park (BNMP; which also includes the Lac and Klein Bonaire Ramsar Sites and the buffer areas of the other three Ramsar Sites where they extend into the marine park.) and the Curaçao Marine Park (CMP), as well as deeper benthic areas and pelagic  areas located in the Territorial Seas and EEZs of both islands. For Bonaire, future linkage of the Ramsar Convention should be sought with the World Heritage Convention. |

G. How can implementation of the Ramsar Convention be better linked with the implementation of water policy/strategy and other strategies in the country (e.g., on sustainable development, energy, extractive industries, poverty reduction, sanitation, food security, biodiversity)?

|  |
| --- |
| The first Caribbean Netherlands Nature Policy Plan 2013-2017 provides the opportunity to link various strategies. A follow-up plan is foreseen. The Bonaire Policy plan (currently a draft) 2018 – 2022 provides further specific policy strategies in relation to the Ramsar Convention. |

H. Do you (AA) have any other general comments on the implementation of the Convention?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

I. Please list the names of the organisations which have been consulted on or have contributed to the information provided in this report:

|  |
| --- |
| Island Government of Bonaire – Directorate of Spatial Planning and Development; WWF Netherlands. |

# Section 3: Indicator questions and further implementation information

# Goal 1. Addressing the drivers of wetland loss and degradation

## *Target 1. Wetland benefits are featured in national/ local policy strategies and plans relating to key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries at the national and local level.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **COP13 REPORT** | | |
| 1.1 Have wetland issues/benefits been incorporated into other national strategies and planning processes, including: {1.3.2} {1.3.3} KRA 1.3.i | | | |
|  | A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant | | |
| a) | National Policy or strategy for wetland management | C | |
| b) | Poverty eradication strategies | Y | |
| c) | Water resource management and water efficiency plans | A | |
| d) | Coastal and marine resource management plans | A | |
| e) | Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan | A | |
| f) | National forest programmes | C | |
| g) | National policies or measures on agriculture | C | |
| h) | National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans drawn up under the CBD | C | |
| i) | National policies on energy and mining | C | |
| j) | National policies on tourism | A | |
| k) | National policies on urban development | A | |
| l) | National policies on infrastructure | A | |
| m) | National policies on industry | A | |
| n) | National policies on aquaculture and fisheries {1.3.3} KRA 1.3.i | A | |
| o) | National plans of actions (NPAs) for pollution control and management | A | |
| p) | National policies on wastewater management and water quality | A | |
| 1.1 Additional information:   |  | | --- | | Some additional information:   * A sewage water treatment plant has been constructed on Bonaire, among others to avoid discharge of sewage water at the coastal coral reefs. * An Ecological restauration project is currently conducted for the Lac site and partially for the Pekelmeer site. * Marine parks, some of which Ramsar sites, exist around the Caribbean islands, for which management plans have been implemented. * The Caribbean Netherlands, Curacao and St. Maarten participate in the implementation of a managementplan for the Exclusive Economic Zone. * Some successful small scale reforestation projects were carried out on Curacao and the Ramsar site Klein Bonaire, among others to restore the indigenous (formerly overgrazed) vegetation. * Horticulture is limited in the Caribbean. The policy on agriculture mainly concerns the management of (currently) free-roaming livestock aiming to avoid overgrazing and consequently the erosion of soil which would sediment and harm wetlands like mangroves, sea grass beds and coral reefs. * The Caribbean Netherlands Nature Policy Plan 2013-2017 includes a biodiversity strategy which also includes wetland conservation. A follow-up plan is foreseen. The Directorate of Nature and Environment of Aruba nominated new protected areas among which potential Ramsar sites. Curacao has several park management plans, but no nature policy plan. St. Maarten has Ministerial working groups and a commission at work on a nature policy vision. | | | | |

## *Target 2. Water use respects wetland ecosystem needs for them to fulfil their functions and provide services at the appropriate scale inter alia at the basin level or along a coastal zone.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COP13 REPORT** | |
| 2.1 Has the quantity and quality of water available to, and required by, wetlands been assessed to support the implementation of the Guidelines for the allocation and management of water for maintaining the ecological functions of wetlands (Resolution VIII.1, VIII.2) ? 1.24. | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 2.1 Additional information:  This is not really an issue in the Caribbean as the wetlands are nearly all part of or are connected to the Caribbean sea, except for the Salinas which are saline lakes of rain water. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.2 Have assessments of environmental flow been undertaken in relation to mitigation of impacts on the ecological character of wetlands (Action r3.4.iv) | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 2.2 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.3 Have Ramsar Sites improved the sustainability of water use in the context of ecosystem requirements? | O |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; O= No Change; X= Unknown |
| 2.3 Additional information:  The marine, saline or brackish waters of the Caribbean Ramsar sites are not being used in the context of ecosystem requirements. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.4 Have the Guidelines for allocation and management of water for maintaining ecological functions of wetlands (Resolutions VIII.1 and XII.12 ) been used/applied in decision-making processes. (Action 3.4.6.) | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 2.4 Additional information:  This is not really an issue in the mainly marine, saline or brackish waters of the Caribbean wetlands. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.5 Have projects that promote and demonstrate good practice in water allocation and management for maintaining the ecological functions of wetlands been developed (Action r3.4.ix. ) | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 2.5 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.6 How many household/municipalities are linked to sewage system? SDG Target 6.3.1. | X |
| E=# household/municipalities; F= Less than #;  G=More than #;  X= Unknown;  Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.6 Additional information:  It’s not exactly known and it differs per island. No sewage system exists on Saba and St. Eustatius. The sewage systems and capacity of sewage treatment plants (STP) on St. Maarten, Curacao, Aruba and Bonaire are limited. Bonaire for instance currently has 1,000 household connections, out of a total of 7,000 households. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.7 What is the percentage of sewerage coverage in the country?  SDG Target 6.3.1. | X |
| E=# percent;  F= Less than # percent;  G= More Than # percent;  X= Unknown;  Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.7 Additional information:  This is 0% for Saba and St. Eustatius. For St. Maarten, Curacao, and Aruba the coverage is also limited but not exactly known. For Bonaire percentage sewarage covearge is about 15%, mainly along the coastal zone in order to protect the reefs from sewarage water. An additional 100 connections are planned on the short term. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.8 What is the percentage of users of septic tank/pit latrine?  SDG Target 6.3.1. | X |
| E=# percent;  F=Less Than # percent;  G= More Than # percent;  X= Unknown;  Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.8 Additional information:  The majority of households/firms use (leak) septic tanks where the waste water from time to time is picked up by a tank to clean it in the sewage treatment plant. Especially older homes have cesspits and the waste water from cesspools disappears into the soil and groundwater. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.9 Does the country use constructed wetlands/ponds as wastewater treatment technology?  SDG Target 6.3.1. | B |
| A= Yes, B= No; C= Partially, D=,Planned X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.9 Additional information: overflow of the wastewater treatment plant is used to create a sweetwater wetland on Bonaire. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.10 How do the country use constructed wetlands/ponds as wastewater treatment technology perform?  SDG Target 6.3.1. | Y |
| A=Good; C=Functioning; B=Not Functioning; Q=Obsolete;  X= Unknown  Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.10 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.11 How many centralised wastewater treatment plants exist at national level? SDG Target 6.3.1. | E = 9 plants |
| E= # plants;  F= Less than #;  G=More than #;  X= Unknown;  Y= Not Relevant |
| * 1. Additional information: * Saba: 0 plants * St. Eustatius: 0 plants * St. Maarten: 1 plant, planning for more * Bonaire: 1 plant * Aruba: 3 plants * Curacao: 4 plants | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.12 How is the functional status of the wastewater treatment plants?  SDG Target 6.3.1. | Q |
| A=Good; C=Functioning; B=Not Functioning; Q=Obsolete; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.12 Additional information:  In general the functional status is obsolete, though the functional status of some plants (like the new plant on Bonaire) is good. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.13 The percentage of decentralized wastewater treatment technology, including constructed wetlands/ponds is?  SDG Target 6.3.1. | X |
| A=Good; C=Functioning; B=Not Functioning; Q=Obsolete; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant |
| 2.13 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.14 Is there a wastewater reuse system?  SDG Target 6.3.1. | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 2.14 Additional information:  There is some reuse of waste water, like on Aruba where advanced treatment plants utilize tertiary filtration (disc filter) and UV disinfection, which allows a large portion of the wastewater to be reused for internal plant use and irrigation. Also Bonaire collects waste water, transports it, purifies it and reuses the water finally as irrigation water and wetland creation. Often reuse is restricted though as the effluent quality may cause health hazards or damage to crops. | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.15 What is the purpose of the wastewater reuse system? SDG Target 6.3.1. | R |
| R=Agriculture; S=Landscape; T=Industrial; U=Drinking; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 2.15 Additional information: Please indicate if the wastewater reuse system is for free or taxed or add any additonal information.  Mainly reuse for irrigation of agricultural land, though it may also be reused in the wastewater plant itself. | |

## *Target.3. Public and private sectors have increased their efforts to apply guidelines and good practices for the wise use of water and wetlands.* {1.10}

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| COP13 REPORT | |
| 3.1 Is the private sector encouraged to apply the Ramsar wise use principle and guidance (Ramsar handbooks for the wise use of wetlands) in its activities and investments concerning wetlands? {1.10.1} KRA 1.10.i | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 3.1 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3.2 Has the private sector undertaken activities or actions for the conservation, wise use and management of? {1.10.2} KRA 1.10.ii:  a) Ramsar Sites  b) Wetlands in general | A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y= Not Relevant |
| a) A  b) A |
| 3.2 Additional information:   * Dive operators active on the islands of the Caribbean Netherlands (islands of Bonaire, Saba and St. Eustatius) routinely instruct their customers on how to behave on sensitive coral reefs. They also actively help with their customers to eliminate invasive lionfish, like on Aruba, Bonaire, Curacao and St. Maarten. * At the Lac Ramsar Site some of the private operators have helped to fund awareness/information programs and in one case a resort has taken on the maintenance of floating lines to protect sea grass. Two kayak tour operators work closely with the management organization and play an important role in creating awareness and compliance with the rules for use of the area. * Cargill Salt Company manages the Pekelmeer Ramsar site and contributes to monitoring of bird species and communicates with government regarding conservation issues. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3.3 Have actions been taken to implement incentive measures which encourage the conservation and wise use of wetlands? {1.11.1} KRA 1.11.i | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned |
| 3.3 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3.4 Have actions been taken to remove perverse incentive measures which discourage conservation and wise use of wetlands? {1.11.2} KRA 1.11.i | **Z** |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable |
| 3.4 Additional information: | |

## *Target 4. Invasive alien species and pathways of introduction and expansion are identified and prioritized, priority invasive alien species are controlled or eradicated, and management responses are prepared and implemented to prevent their introduction and establishment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COP13 REPORT** | |
| 4.1 Does your country have a national inventory of invasive alien species that currently or potentially impact the ecological character of wetlands? {1.9.1} KRA 1.9.i | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 4.1 Additional information:  The "Team Invasieve Exoten" (team on invasive alien species, Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority) supports the Ministry of EL&I on the implementation of its policy to control invasive species. One of the main activities of the team is to (let) carry out risk analysis and monitoring of invasive species. Furthermore, the team established an alien species surveillance network, consisting of volunteers and professionals. These activities are relevant to all habitats, including wetlands. For the Caribbean Netherlands (islands of Bonaire, Saba and St. Eustatius) as well as for Aruba, Curacao and St. Maarten an inventory of invasive species has been completed and a strategy to address the invasive species was completed in 2014. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4.2 Have national policies or guidelines on invasive species control and management been established or reviewed for wetlands? {1.9.2} KRA 1.9.iii | **C** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 4.2 Additional information:  Inventories for invasive species are available for all Dutch Caribbean islands, and strategies to manage these species are underway. Early December 2017 a workshop was held at the Netherlands Science Institute of St. Eustatius to raise awareness on the topic. Action point will be discussed in a follow-up session.  Each island already has a management plan to deal with invasive Lionfish. Bonaire has identified certain invasive species (i.e. Lionfish) upon which eradication procedures have been establisched through nature legislation. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4.3 How many invasive species are being controlled through management actions?. | E = 0 species |
| E= # species; F=Less than #; G=More than #; C=Partially; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 4.3 Additional information: (If ‘Yes’, please indicate the year of assessment and the source of the information):  Inventories for invasive species are available for all Dutch Caribbean islands, and strategies to manage these species are underway. Each island already has a management plan to deal with invasive Lionfish. Bonaire has identified certain invasive species (i.e. Lionfish and the Rubber Vine) upon which eradication procedures have been established through nature legislation. On Aruba there are annual volunteer hunts of Boa Constrictor, but these don’t keep pace with the increasing Boa population. So there are eradication measures but these seem to be insufficient to actually control the invasive species. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4.4 Have the effectiveness of wetland invasive alien species control programmes been assessed? | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 4.4 Additional information:  This requests capacity and funding for monitoring which is lacking. | |

# Goal 2. Effectively conserving and managing the Ramsar Site network

## *Target 5. The ecological character of Ramsar Sites is maintained or restored through effective, planning and integrated management {2.1.}*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COP13 REPORT** | |
| 5.1 Have a national strategy and priorities been established for the further designation of Ramsar Sites, using the *Strategic Framework for the Ramsar List*? {2.1.1} KRA 2.1.i | **C** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 5.1 Additional information: -  One of the actions in the Nature Policy Plan Caribbean Netherlands 2013-2017 concerned an inventory of all wetlands and an evaluation of the management of current Ramsar sites (Bonaire, Saba and St. Eustatius). Aruba is currently in the process to designate a number of protected areas among which the designation of new Ramsar sites. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.2 Are the Ramsar Sites Information Service and its tools being used in national identification of further Ramsar Sites to designate? {2.2.1} KRA 2.2.ii | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| 5.2 Additional information:  Not specifically but the nine Ramsar Criteria are applied, for instance on Aruba, to identify which sites would qualify as new Ramsar sites. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.3 How many Ramsar Sites have an effective, implemented management plan? {2.4.1} KRA 2.4.i | E = 7 sites |
| E= # sites; F=Less than #; G=More than #; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 5.4 For how many of the Ramsar Sites with a management plan is the plan being implemented?  {2.4.2} KRA 2.4.i | E = 7 sites |
| E= # sites; F=Less than #; G=More than #; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 5.5 For how many Ramsar Sites is effective management planning currently being implemented (outside of formal management plans ? {2.4.3} KRA 2.4.i | E = 7 sites |
| E= # sites; F=Less than #; G=More than #; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 5.3 – 5.5 Additional information:  The difference in the questions 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 is (too) subtile and actually not very clear. Therefore we consider these questions, as well as their answers, as more or less similar.  Basically there are currently 10 Ramsar sites: 1 on St. Maarten, 5 on Bonaire, 4 on Curacao and 1 on Aruba. Saba and Statia have no Ramsar sites.   * St. Maarten: the one site on St. Maarten (Mullet Pond) has been designated in 2014. The site and the largest part of the mangroves were severely damaged after hurricane Irma in September 2017. Current management efforts are mainly focussed on finding funds for restoration measures, as the area was found littered with large debris, sunken boats and even houseboats that were illegally anchored there for the hurricane. A regular management plan and associated actions depend on the status of the site after completion of the restoration measures. * Bonaire: two of the present 5 Ramsar sites (Slagbaai and Goto Lake) are in the process to be merged and enlarged into one major Ramsar site: the Washington Slagbaai National Park. This enlargement will also include a number of other saline lakes that were previously not designated under Ramsar. Two (Lac and Klein Bonaire) of the five Ramsar sites on Bonaire fall under the marine park management plan. The other three sites currently have no management plans Bonaire has planned to assess specific management plans for all sites between 2018 and 2019. * Curacao: the four sites on Curacao each have a management plan but these are still being fine-tuned and are not yet fully implemented. * Aruba: the one site on Aruba (Spaans Lagoen) has been incorporated within the Arikok National Park in 2017. A managementplan for the site is foreseen. Additional new Ramsar site designation for Aruba are foreseen. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.6 Have all Ramsar sites been assessed regarding the effectiveness of their management (through formal management plans where they exist or otherwise through existing actions for appropriate wetland management ? {1.6.2} KRA 1.6.ii | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 5.6 Additional information:  The Dutch Caribbean Nature Alliance (DCNA, established in 2005) is a regional network of protected areas set up to help and assist the protected area organisations on the islands of Aruba, Bonaire, Curacao, Saba, St Eustatius and St Maarten. Despite improvements, these parks (Ramsar sites included) still lack sufficient capacity and funding for adequate management planning processes. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.7 How many Ramsar Sites have a cross-sectoral management committee? {2.4.4} {2.4.6} KRA 2.4.iv | E= 4 sites |
| E= # sites; F=Less than #; G=More than #; C= Partially; X=Unknown, Y=Not Relevant; |
| 5.7 Additional information (If at least 1 site, please give the name and official number of the site or sites):  Four of the five ramsar sites on Bonaire fall under the management of the National Park Foundation, Stinapa Bonaire. The Board of Stinapa Bonaire consists of representatives of all relevant sectors. In addition, nature management decisions are subject to advise from the Island Nature Commission which includes representatives from various sectors. Once the management plans of the four sites on Curacao are fully implemented, they will include strong involvement of the local community. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.8 For how many Ramsar Sites has an ecological character description been prepared (see Resolution X.15)? {2.4.5}{2.4.7} KRA 2.4.v | E = 9 sites |
| E=# sites; F=Less than #; G=More than; C= Partially #; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 5.8 Additional information (If at least 1 site, please give the name and official number of the site or sites):  Ramsar Information Sheets (RIS), which include ecological character descriptions, have been prepared for all sites (of which two sites on Bonaire have been merged into one site). Several RIS still need to be uploaded though, to the database of the Ramsar Site Information Service (RSIS). | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.9 Have any assessments of the effectiveness of Ramsar Site management been made? {2.5.1} KRA 2.5.i | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Some Sites |
| 5.9 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Some sites’, please indicate the year of assessment, which assessment tool did you use (e.g. METT, Resolution XII.15, and the source of the information):  Although management effectiveness assessments for the protected areas under management of Stinapa Bonaire have been carried out through DCNA, the assessments did not look at specific effectiveness with regard to the Ramsar Sites.  One of the actions in the Nature Policy Plan Caribbean Netherlands 2013-2017 concerns an inventory of all wetlands and an evaluation of the management of current Ramsar sites (Bonaire, Saba and St. Eustatius). | |

## *Target 7.* *Sites that are at risk of change of ecological character have threats addressed {2.6.}.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COP13 REPORT** | |
| 7.1 Are mechanisms in place for the Administrative Authority to be informed of negative human-induced changes or likely changes in the ecological character of Ramsar Sites, pursuant to Article 3.2? {2.6.1} KRA 2.6.i | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Some Sites; D=Planned |
| 7.1 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Some sites’, please summarise the mechanism or mechanisms established):  For the Caribbean sites there is still a lack of capacity and funding for adequate monitoring of human induced changes or likely changes of the ecological character. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 7.2 Have all cases of negative human-induced change or likely change in the ecological character of Ramsar Sites been reported to the Ramsar Secretariat, pursuant to Article 3.2? {2.6.2} KRA 2.6.i | **C** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Some Cases; O=No Negative Change |
| 7.2 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Some cases’, please indicate for which Ramsar Sites the Administrative Authority has made Article 3.2 reports to the Secretariat, and for which sites such reports of change or likely change have not yet been made):  All human-induced changes have been reported in the Ramsar Information Sheets which updated version has been (or will soon be ) uploaded to the Ramsar secretariat. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 7.3 If applicable, have actions been taken to address the issues for which Ramsar Sites have been listed on the Montreux Record, including requesting a Ramsar Advisory Mission? {2.6.3} KRA 2.6.ii | **Z** |
| A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable |
| 7.3 Additional information (If ‘Yes’, please indicate the actions taken):  Currently no Ramsar sites in the Dutch Caribbean are listed on the Montreux record. | |

# Goal 3. Wisely Using All Wetlands

## *Target 8.* *National wetland inventories have been either initiated, completed or updated and disseminated and used for promoting the conservation and effective management of all wetlands {1.1.1} KRA 1.1.i*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COP13 REPORT** | |
| 8.1 Does your country have a complete National Wetland Inventory? {1.1.1} KRA 1.1.i | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; D=Planned |
| 8.1 Additional information:  One of the actions in the Caribbean Netherlands Nature Policy Plan 2013-2017 concerned an inventory of all wetlands and an evaluation of the management of current Ramsar sites in the Caribbean Netherlands (islands of Bonaire, Saba and St. Eustatius). For Curacao an inventory of nine potential Ramsar sites has resulted in the designation of four sites on 5-2-2013. The government of Aruba plans to designate new protected areas, and aims to assign four of them the Ramsar status. Wetland inventory data are collected for that purpose. Wetland monitoring and collection of management relevant data is still a concern though due to capacity and budget constraints. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8.2 Has your country updated a National Wetland Inventory in the last decade? | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; C1= Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 8.2 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8.3 Is wetland inventory data and information maintained? {1.1.2} KRA 1.1.ii | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 8.3 Additional information:  An advanced network of monitoring, data storage and data sharing as in the Netherlands is lacking for the Dutch Caribbean islands. Much data had been collected, but no central data coordinating unit was set up to guarantee the availability of these data to stakeholders. Data and studies were widely scattered and hard to access by managers or policy decision makers. Past couple of years however a Dutch Caribbean Biodiversity Database has been set up and now contains information on over 4000 species: http://www.dcbd.nl/  A knowledge system exists for the Caribbean Netherlands which brings together all available biodiversity information for the islands and also includes a database for monitoring data. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8.4 Is wetland inventory data and information made accessible to all stakeholders? {1.1.2} KRA 1.1.ii | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 8.4 Additional information:  The Dutch Caribbean Biodiversity Database is available for all stakeholders (<http://www.dcbd.nl/>), as well as specific Ramsar information at the Ramsar Sites Information Service. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8.5 Has the condition\* of wetlands in your country, overall, changed during the last triennium? {1.1.3}  a) Ramsar Sites  b) wetlands generally  Please describe on the sources of the information on which your answer is based in the green free- text box below. If there is a difference between inland and coastal wetland situations, please describe. If you are able to, please describe the principal driver(s) of the change(s).  \* ‘Condition’ corresponds to ecological character, as defined by the Convention | N=Status Deteriorated; O=No Change; P=Status Improved |
| a) O  b) O |
| 8.5 Additional information on a) and/or b):  The period of three years is too short and the available data too limited to assess any change, but overall the impression is that there is no change. However, the hurricanes in September 2017 (Irma, Maria) seriously damaged Ramsar site Mullet Pond on St. Maarten. A quantification of the damage as well as its natural recovery is not available.  Restoration measures in Ramsar site Spaans Lagoen on Aruba in 2016-2017, may have seriously improved the ecologic condition of the site (<http://www.dcnanature.org/mangrove-restoration-spaans-lagoen/>). Monitoring data to confirm this are yet not available. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8.6 Based upon the National Wetland Inventory if available please provide a baseline figure in square kilometres for the extent of wetlands (according to the Ramsar definition) for the year 2017. SDG Target 6.6 | G = More than 63 Km 2 |
| E= # Km 2 ; F=Less than #; G=More than #; A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 8.6 Additional information: If the information is available please indicate the % of change in the extent of wetlands over the last three years.  The figure of 63 km² is the total area of all Dutch Caribbean Ramsar sites. The total area is much larger as there are also other wetland areas with a protected or non-protected status. The exact area (according to the Ramsar definition) has not been determined yet. | |

## *Target 9. The wise use of wetlands is strengthened through integrated resource management at the appropriate scale, inter alia, within a river basin or along a coastal zone {1.3.}.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COP13 REPORT** | |
| 9.1 Is a Wetland Policy (or equivalent instrument) that promotes the wise use of wetlands in place? {1.3.1} KRA 1.3.i  (If ‘Yes’, please give the title and date of the policy in the green text box) | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned |
| 9.1 Additional information:  The Netherlands Antilles was an autonomous Caribbean country within the Kingdom of the Netherlands. Aruba seceded in 1986 as a separate country within the Kingdom, and the rest dissolved on 10 October 2010, resulting in two new constituent countries within the Kingdom, Curaçao and Sint Maarten, and the so-called Caribbean Netherlands. The Caribbean Netherlands comprises the islands of Bonaire, St. Eustatius and Saba, directly joining the Netherlands as "special municipalities". The Wetland Policy for the Caribbean Netherlands is an integral part of the Caribbean Netherlands Nature Policy Plan 2013-2017. A nature policy plan for Aruba, integrating wetlands, is being prepared as well as a nature policy vision for St. Maarten. Curacao does not have a National nature or wetland policy. Bonaire is currently renewing its nature policy plan (2018 – 2022) through which wetland policy & management is addressed. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.2 Have any amendments to existing legislation been made to reflect Ramsar commitments? {1.3.5}{1.3.6} | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; D=Planned |
| 9.2 Additional information:  The Law on Spatial Planning for Bonaire adopted in 2009 specifically allocated it’s five Ramsar sites and enacted bufferzones around these Ramsar sites in order to improve the protection of these sites. The Development Plan Klein Bonaire (2000) has taken into account the Ramsar Convention. The Nature Ordinance Bonaire (2008) and its underlying decrees (2010) are applicable to the Ramsar sites focussing specifically on species and habitat protection. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.3 Do your country’s water governance and management systems treat wetlands as natural water infrastructure integral to water resource management at the scale of river basins? {1.7.1} {1.7.2} KRA 1.7.ii | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| 9.3 Additional information:  Rivers do not exist at the Dutch Caribbean islands, but the wetlands are treated at the scale of their water catchment area. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.4 Have Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness (CEPA) expertise and tools been incorporated into catchment/river basin planning and management (see Resolution X.19)? {1.7.2}{1.7.3} | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| 9.4 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.5 Has your country established policies or guidelines for enhancing the role of wetlands in mitigating or adapting to climate change? {1.7.3} {1.7.5} KRA 1.7.iii | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 9.5 Additional information:  Climate change is, among others, likely to result in more intense rain and hurricane events. This requests ecosystem services like storage of rain water, sedimentation of eroded sediment and coastal protection against storm surge waves.  Salinas provide ecosystem services like sedimentation and storage of rain water. Mangroves and seagrass-beds provide ecosystem services like sedimentation and coastal protection. Coral reefs provide coastal protection services. The importance of these ecosystem services is increasingly recognised. Among others through TEEB-studies on Bonaire, St. Eustatius, Saba and Aruba (<http://www.wolfscompany.com/category/teeb/>) and an economic evaluation study on <http://waittinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Curacao-Economic-Valuation-June-2016.pdf>. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.6 Has your country formulated plans or projects to sustain and enhance the role of wetlands in supporting and maintaining viable farming systems? {1.7.4} {1.7.6} KRA 1.7.v | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 9.6 Additional information:  In the Caribbean Netherlands there are no fresh water wetlands relevant to farming systems. With the exception of karst systems that hold underground fresh water all wetlands are saline to hyper-saline. On the other hand there exists a system of dams to seasonally collect rainwater for irrigation. Such dams result in many cases in seasonal wetlands, that provide resting and feeding areas for migratory waterbirds and nesting areas for some resident waterbirds. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.7 Has research to inform wetland policies and plans been undertaken in your country on:  a) agriculture-wetland interactions  b) climate change  c) valuation of ecoystem services  {1.6.1} KRA 1.6.i | A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| a) A  b) A  c) A |
| 9.7 Additional information:  In the past a variety of research projects/monitoring have been conducted in the Bonaire Ramsar Sites.  The Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality (formerly Economic Affairs) has funded three research programs for the (Caribbean) Netherlands to be carried out by the Wageningen University and Research Centre.  - "Beleidsondersteunend onderzoek" (Policy Support Reseach): this research supports the realisation of the societal task of the Ministry of Economic Affairs.  - "Wettelijke onderzoekstaken" (Legal Research Tasks): research to support laws and regulations.  - "Kennisbasisonderzoek" (Knowledgebase Research): research for the development of knowledge that will become relevant on a medium term for the Ministry and other social parties. The topics on agricultural interactions, climate change and valuation of ecosystem services are all covered by these three research programs.  Besides these research programs, TEEB-studies on Bonaire, St. Eustatius, Saba and Aruba have been conducted (<http://www.wolfscompany.com/category/teeb/>) and an economic evaluation study on <http://waittinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Curacao-Economic-Valuation-June-2016.pdf>. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9.8 Has your country submitted a request for Wetland City Accreditation of the Ramsar Convention, Resolution XII.10 ? | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 9.8 Additional information: (If ‘Yes’, please indicate How many request have been submitted): | |

## *Target 10. The traditional knowledge innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities relevant for the wise use of wetlands and their customary use of wetland resources, are documented, respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with a full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities at all relevant levels.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COP13 REPORT** | |
| 10.1 Have the guiding principles for taking into account the cultural values of wetlands including traditional knowledge for the effective management of sites (Resolution VIII.19) been used or applied?.(Action 6.1.2/ 6.1.6) | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; C1= Partially; D= Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 10.1 Additional information:  Management of natural and cultural heritage is an integral part of wetland management plans. Local stakeholders have a role in the management planning process and can also take part in the implementation of (cultural) activities. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 10.2 Have case studies, participation in projects or successful experiences on cultural aspects of wetlands been compiled. Resolution VIII.19 and Resolution IX.21? (Action 6.1.6) | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned |
| 10.2 Additional information: (If yes please indicate the case studies or projects documenting information and experiences concerning culture and wetlands). | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 10.3 Have the guidelines for establishing and strengthening local communities’ and indigenous people’s participation in the management of wetlands been used or applied**.** (Resolution VII. 8) (Action 6.1.5) | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned |
| 10.3 Additional information: (If the answer is “yes” please indicate the use or aplication of the guidelines)  Not relevant. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 10.4 Traditional knowledge and management practices relevant for the wise use of wetlands have been documented and their  application encouraged (Action 6.1.2 ) | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; D=Planned |
| 10.4 Additional information:  Not relevant. | |

## *Target 11. Wetland functions, services and benefits are widely demonstrated, documented and disseminated. {1.4.}*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COP13 REPORT** | |
| 11.1 Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by Ramsar Sites and other wetlands? {1.4.1} KRA 1.4.ii | C1 |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=In Preparation; C1=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 11.1 Additional information: (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please indicate, how many Ramsar Sites and their names):   |  | | --- | | Not on Ramsar-sites specifically but from 2012 onwards, TEEB-studies have been published on the islands of Bonaire, St. Eustatius, Saba and Aruba (see <http://www.wolfscompany.com/category/teeb/>) and an economic evaluation study on <http://waittinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Curacao-Economic-Valuation-June-2016.pdf>. | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 11.2 Have wetland programmes or projects that contribute to poverty alleviation objectives or food and water security plans been implemented? {1.4.2} KRA 1.4.i | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 11.2 Additional information:  Not relevant. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 11.3 Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for Ramsar Sites and other wetlands? {1.4.3}{1.4.4} KRA 1.4.iii | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 11.3 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please indicate, if known, how many Ramsar Sites and their names):   |  | | --- | | For the Lac Ramsar Site on Bonaire. | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 11.4 Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for Ramsar Sites and other wetlands? {1.4.3}{1.4.4} KRA 1.4.iii | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 11.4 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please indicate, if known, how many Ramsar Sites and their names):  For the Lac Ramsar Site on Bonaire. | |

## *Target 12. Restoration is in progress in degraded wetlands, with priority to wetlands that are relevant for biodiversity conservation, disaster risk reduction, livelihoods and/or climate change mitigation and adaptation. {1.8.}*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COP13 REPORT** | |
| 12.1 Have priority sites for wetland restoration been identified? {1.8.1} KRA 1.8.i | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 12.1 Additional information:  For instance restoration of wetlands that have silted up like Spaans Lagoen on Aruba and Lac Bonaire (Ecological restoration project Lac), but also Mullet Pond on St. Maarten that suffered from the September 2017 hurricanes. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 12.2 Have wetland restoration/rehabilitation programmes, plans or projects been effectively implemented? {1.8.2} KRA 1.8.i | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 12.2 Additional information: (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please indicate, if available the extent of wetlands restored ):  Like:   |  | | --- | | * Mangrove restoration at Spaans Lagoen, Aruba (2017; see <http://www.dcnanature.org/mangrove-restoration-spaans-lagoen/>) * Mangrove reforestation on St. Maarten (2014; see <http://www.dcnanature.org/mangrove-reforestation-on-st-maarten/>). * Coral restoration and rehabilitation in the Dutch Caribbean (2013 onwards; see:   + <http://www.dcnanature.org/coral-restoration/>   + <http://www.dcnanature.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/BioNews_2017_3_Nature-funding-projects-coral-restoration.pdf>   + <http://www.dcnanature.org/coral-reef-rehabilitation-in-the-dutch-caribbean/>). * Reforestation small islands of Klein Curacao and Klein Bonaire Ramsar site (2013 onwards; see <http://www.dcnanature.org/reforestation-klein-curacao-and-klein-bonaire-successful/>). * Ecological Restoration Lac project. * restoration project for dams and abandoned mining pits on Bonaire (2017; (<http://www.dcnanature.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/BioNews-2017-8-Erosion-Nature-Restoration-Bonaire.pdf>). | | |

## *Target 13. Enhanced sustainability of key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries when they affect wetlands, contributing to biodiversity conservation and human livelihoods*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| COP13 REPORT | |
| 13.1 Have actions been taken to enhance sustainability of key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries when they affect wetlands? | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| 13.1. Additional information: (If ‘Yes’, please indicate the actions taken):  Like:   * A waste water treatment plant in Bonaire started to operate early 2015 and is among others aimed to decrease the nutrient load on the marine ecosystem; * In 2015, STINAPA and the island government started a project aimed at decreasing the goat population in the Washington-Slagbaai Park (and Ramsar site); * Wageningen Livestock Research (part of Wageningen University and Research Centre in the Netherlands), in cooperation with the Bonaire island government and local stakeholders, are working on opportunities for sustainable livestock farming. * In 2015 the Bonaire government and local stakeholders were working on a program to remove female donkeys from the wild in a camp and sterilize male donkeys. This program has been stopped now. * In 2016 a sediment trap was built along one of the waterfeeders to Lac. Infrastructure was put in place to prevent further mangrove destruction. * On St. Eustatius the LVV is setting up a structural program to remove free roaming donkeys from the wild and to catch and slaughter free-roaming cattle. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 13.2 Are Strategic Environmental Assessment practices applied when reviewing policies, programmes and plans that may impact upon wetlands? {1.3.3} {1.3.4} KRA 1.3.ii | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 13.2 Additional information:  For Bonaire a strategic EIA was conducted as part of the spatial planning incorporating wetlands and Ramsar sites. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 13.3 Are Environmental Impact Assessments made for any development projects (such as new buildings, new roads, extractive industry) from key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries that may affect wetlands? {1.3.4} {1.3.5} KRA 1.3.iii | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Some Cases |
| 13.3 Additional information:  Not all coastal development in or close to wetlands currently requires an EIA to be initiated. | |

# GOAL 4. Enhancing implementation

## *Target 15. Ramsar Regional Initiatives with the active involvement and support of the Parties in each region are reinforced and developed into effective tools to assist in the full implementation of the Convention. {3.2.}*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COP13 REPORT** | |
| 15.1 Have you (AA) been involved in the development and implementation of a Regional Initiative under the framework of the Convention? {3.2.1} KRA 3.2.i | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| 15.1 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Planned’, please indicate the regional initiative(s) and the collaborating countries of each initiative):   |  | | --- | | The Netherlands, through the focal point in the Caribbean Netherlands, is actively involved in the Caribbean Wetlands Initiative. | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 15.2 Has your country supported or participated in the development of other regional (i.e., covering more than one country) wetland training and research centres? {3.2.2} | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| 15.2 Additional information (If ‘Yes’, please indicate the name(s) of the centre(s): | |

## *Target 16*. *Wetlands conservation and wise use are mainstreamed through communication, capacity development, education, participation and awareness {4.1}.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COP13 REPORT** | |
| 16.1 Has an action plan (or plans) for wetland CEPA been established? {4.1.1} KRA 4.1.i   1. At the national level 2. Sub-national level 3. Catchment/basin level 4. Local/site level   (Even if no CEPA plans have been developed, if broad CEPA objectives for CEPA actions have been established, please indicate this in the Additional information section below) | A=Yes; B=No; C=In Progress; D=Planned |
| a) D  b) A  c) B  d) B |
| 16.1 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘In progress’ to one or more of the four questions above, for each please describe the mechanism, who is responsible and identify if it has involved CEPA NFPs):  Though not specifically on wetlands, several CEPA materials have been developed, like:   * The parks and conservation organizations of the Dutch Caribbean have developed nature education materials for youth in different age-classes (see <http://www.dcnanature.org/resources/nature-education/>). * The management organization for the Ramsar Sites on Bonaire has a general nature education program and awareness activities which includes information on the Ramsar sites, in particular the Lac site, and other wetlands. The STCB (Sea Turtle Conservation Bonaire) has a public awareness campaign for sea turtles and seagrass focussing on the Lac Ramsar Site. * Bonaire has started with a broad nature awareness and communication campaign (nos ta biba di naturalesa, <http://www.bibadinaturalesa.com/>; <https://www.facebook.com/NTBDN/>) which will run from 2017 – 2019. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16.2 How many centres (visitor centres, interpretation centres, education centres) have been established? {4.1.2} KRA 4.1.ii  a) at Ramsar Sites  b) at other wetlands | E= # centres; F=Less than #; G=More than #; C= Partially; X=Unknown; y=Not Relevant; |
| a) E = 2 centres  b) E = 0 |
| 16.2 Additional information (If centres are part of national or international networks, please describe the networks):  Both Bonaire and Curacau have an education centre:   * An education/recreational centre at Washington Slagbaai (Bonaire). * The CARMABI Marine Education Centre (MEC) which was inaugurated in June 2015. The **MEC is part of a broader Marine Education Program (MEP) designed specifically for the schools on Curaçao.** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16.3 Does the Contracting Party:   1. promote stakeholder participation in decision-making on wetland planning and management 2. specifically involve local stakeholders in the selection of new Ramsar Sites and in Ramsar Site management?   {4.1.3} KRA 4.1.iii | A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| a) A  b) C |
| 16.3 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please provide information about the ways in which stakeholders are involved):   * Within the framework of the management plan for the Lac site on Bonaire, stakeholders are informed and consulted about recreational use, and the conch restoration project. * Local stakeholders, especially dive shop owners and volunteers participate in the elimination of invasive Lionfish, like on Aruba, Bonaire, Curacao and St. Maarten. * On Bonaire 'Dive Friends Bonaire' started Debris Free Bonaire in December 2012 (<http://www.debrisfreebonaire.com/>). As of December 2017, Debris Free Bonaire volunteers have collectively removed over 350 cubic meters of marine plastic debris. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16.4 Do you have an operational cross-sectoral National Ramsar/Wetlands Committee? {4.1.6} KRA 4.3.v | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 16.4 Additional information (If ‘Yes’, indicate a) its membership; b) number of meetings since COP12; and c) what responsibilities the Committee has):  No such Committee has been established yet for the Dutch Caribbean, but is present in The Netherlands. For more details, see the non-Caribbean part of the National Report. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16.5 Do you have an operational cross-sectoral body equivalent to a National Ramsar/Wetlands Committee? {4.1.6} KRA 4.3.v | B |
| A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; D=Planned; X=Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 16.5 Additional information (If ‘Yes’, indicate a) its membership; b) number of meetings since COP12; and c) what responsibilities the Committee has): | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16.6 Are other communication mechanisms (apart from a national committee) in place to share Ramsar implementation guidelines and other information between the Administrative Authority and:   1. Ramsar Site managers 2. other MEA national focal points 3. other ministries, departments and agencies   {4.1.7} KRA 4.1.vi | A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| a) A  b) A  c) A |
| 16.6 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please describe what mechanisms are in place):  Regular information exchange meetings are held on Bonaire between the focal point for the Caribbean Netherlands, the island government, the protected areas management organization, and other relevant NGOs. The focal point for the Caribbean Netherlands is in close contact with the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the NFPs in the Netherlands. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16.7 Have Ramsar-branded World Wetlands Day activities (whether on 2 February or at another time of year), either government and NGO-led or both, been carried out in the country since COP12? {4.1.8} | B |
| A=Yes; B=No |
| 16.7 Additional information:  Not specifically a World Wetland Day but:   * on Saturday 13th of May 2017, STINAPA participated in Global Big Day (organized by The Cornell Lab of Ornithology), a worldwide event where different species of birds are counted in one day. * Each year the Dutch Caribbean islands celebrate the migration of birds. Thanks to the support of Birds Caribbean and Environment for the America’s, the parks and conservation organisations of the Dutch Caribbean are equipped with some of the latest and greatest bird education materials to support their migratory bird day events. On St. Eustatius (Statia) for example, bird lessons were held with grades 5 and 6 from each primary school. These “bird lessons” are now one of the most popular lessons offered by nature conservation NGO STENAPA. The Statia Junior Ranger after school program was able to conduct a migratory bird activity in the field. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16.8 Have campaigns, programmes, and projects (other than for World Wetlands Day-related activities) been carried out since COP12 to raise awareness of the importance of wetlands to people and wildlife and the ecosystem benefits/services provided by wetlands? {4.1.9} | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned |
| 16.8 Additional information (If these and other CEPA activities have been undertaken by other organizations, please indicate this):   * The results of the TEEB-studies on Bonaire, Saba, St. Eustatius and Aruba have been/will be presented to the public. * Bionews, the newsletter of the Dutch Caribbean Nature Alliance raises awareness on the importance of nature (among which wetlands) and the ecosystem services it provides (see <http://www.dcnanature.org/>). * The awareness and communication programme Nos ta biba di naturalesa has started in 2017 on Bonaire. | |

## *Target 17.* *Financial and other resources for effectively implementing the fourth Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 – 2024 from all sources are made available. {4.2.}*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COP13 REPORT** | |
| 17.1  a) Have Ramsar contributions been paid in full for 2015, 2016 and 2017? {4.2.1} KRA 4.2.i | A |
| A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable |
| b) If ‘No’ in 17.1 a), please clarify what plan is in place to ensure future prompt payment: | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 17.2 Has any additional financial support been provided through voluntary contributions to non-core funded Convention activities? {4.2.2} KRA 4.2.i | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No |
| 17.2 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ please state the amounts, and for which activities): | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 17.3 [For Contracting Parties with a development assistance agency only (‘donor countries’)]: Has the agency provided funding to support wetland conservation and management in other countries? {3.3.1} KRA 3.3.i | **Z** |
| A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable |
| 17.3 Additional information (If ‘Yes’, please indicate the countries supported since COP12): | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 17.4 [For Contracting Parties with a development assistance agency only (‘donor countries’)]: Have environmental safeguards and assessments been included in development proposals proposed by the agency? {3.3.2} KRA 3.3.ii | Z |
| A=Yes; B=No; C= Partially; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant; Z=Not Applicable |
| 17.4 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 17.5 [For Contracting Parties that have received development assistance only (‘recipient countries’)]: Has funding support been received from development assistance agencies specifically for in-country wetland conservation and management? {3.3.3} | **Z** |
| A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable |
| 17.5 Additional information (If ‘Yes’, please indicate from which countries/agencies since COP12): | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 17.6 Has any financial support been provided by your country to the implementation of the Strategic Plan? | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; Z=Not Applicable |
| 17.6 Additional information (If “Yes” please state the amounts, and for which activities): | |

## *Target 18. International cooperation is strengthened at all levels {3.1}*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COP13 REPORT** | |
| 18.1 Are the national focal points of other MEAs invited to participate in the National Ramsar/Wetland Committee? {3.1.1} {3.1.2} KRAs 3.1.i & 3.1.iv | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 18.1 Additional information:  The focal point for the Caribbean Netherlands for Ramsar, SPAW, IAC, WHMSI and ICRI is based on Bonaire in the Caribbean and consequently cannot easily participate in a Netherlands based Committee. However there is close contact with the National focal points in the Netherlands. As yet there is no Ramsar/Wetland Committee for the Dutch Caribbean | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.2 Are mechanisms in place at the national level for collaboration between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the focal points of UN and other global and regional bodies and agencies (e.g. UNEP, UNDP, WHO, FAO, UNECE, ITTO)? {3.1.2} {3.1.3} KRA 3.1.iv | **C** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 18.2 Additional information:  The focal point for the Caribbean Netherlands for the Cartagena Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean, which is the legal instrument of the UNEP Regional Seas Programme for the Caribbean, is also the focal point for the Ramsar Caribbean Initiative, assuring short communication lines between UNEP and Ramsar at the regional level. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.3 Has your country received assistance from one or more UN and other global and regional bodies and agencies (e.g. UNEP, UNDP, WHO, FAO, UNECE, ITTO) or the Convention’s IOPs in its implementation of the Convention? {4.4.1} KRA 4.4.ii.  The IOPs are: BirdLife International, the International Water Management Institute (IWMI), IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature), Wetlands International, WWF and Wildfowl & Wetland Trust (WWT). | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 18.3 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ please name the agency (es) or IOP (s) and the type of assistance received):   |  | | --- | | * WWF-NL is an international partner of STCB (<http://www.bonaireturtles.org/wp/about-us/partners-and-supporters/>). WWF-NL also financially supports Boneiru Duradero on Bonaire with projects relevant to RAMSAR sites on sunscreen/plastics as well as SCF, SBMU and STENAPA. Additionally WWF-NL supports a fisheries project that aims to reduce fishing pressure on coastal habitats. * Vogelbescherming Nederland (Dutch partner of Birldlife International) provides support through DCNA for bird monitoring, GIS training and other capacity building efforts for all the islands (<https://www.vogelbescherming.nl/bescherming/wat-wij-doen/internationaal/versterken-partners-birdlife-international/antillen>). In 2015 DCNA, Vogelbescherming and the BirdLife-regional office signed an agreement aiming for DCNA to become a full partner of Birdlife International; * WWF-NL, DCNA and the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs (now Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality) raised an emergency fund to support nature organisations on St. Maarten, Saba and St. Eustatius on nature restoration after the devastating September 2017 hurricanes. * The Caribbean Waterbird Census (CWC) Workshop was held on 13th – 16th January 2015 at the Carmabi Foundation Science Center (Curacao). This workshop was part of an initiative being led by BirdsCaribbean (formerly SCSCB) aiming to build capacity for waterbird and wetland conservation in the region. | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.4 Have networks, including twinning arrangements, been established, nationally or internationally, for knowledge sharing and training for wetlands that share common features? {3.4.1} | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 18.4 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please indicate the networks and wetlands  The Dutch Caribbean Nature Alliance (DCNA) is the umbrella organization of the protected areas (terrestrial and marine) management organizations of all six islands of the Dutch Caribbean. It functions as an effective network that regularly meets for knowledge exchange, organizes staff exchanges, and a wide range of training workshops, in many cases very relevant to management of wetlands. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.5 Has information about your country’s wetlands and/or Ramsar Sites and their status been made public (e.g., through publications or a website)? {3.4.2} KRA 3.4.iv | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 18.5 Additional information:   * The DCNA website lists all protected areas, which includes most of the Ramsar areas, but they are not highlighted separately. * Sea Turtle Conservation Bonaire (STCB) has devoted a webpage to seagrass protection in the Lac Ramsar site (<http://www.bonaireturtles.org/wp/what-we-do/seagrass-protection/>). In March 2016, STCB organized a stakeholders meeting to share the results from an evaluation of the seagrass protection project. * STCB also reports on the number of sea turtle nests on the island of Bonaire and the Ramsar site of Klein Bonaire (<http://www.bonaireturtles.org/wp/what-we-do/nest-monitoring/>). * The Bonaire Spatial Plan has incorporated the Ramsar sites and inherent buffer areas together with legislature and regulations. This Spatial plan is available online. * Information sheets including the protected areas such as Ramsar sites have been developed for the Island Nature Ordinance and decrees on Bonaire. * The Dutch Caribbean Biodiversity Database ([www.dcbd.nl](http://www.dcbd.nl)) includes most relevant publications on biodiversity (including wetlands) of the Dutch Caribbean Islands. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.6 Has information about your country’s wetlands and/or Ramsar Sites been transmitted to the Ramsar Secretariat for dissemination? {3.4.3} KRA 3.4.ii | C |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 18.6 Additional information:  Most Ramsar Information Sheets have been disseminated to the Ramsar secretariat, some are in the finale phase to be transferred to the secretariat. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.7 Have all transboundary wetland systems been identified? {3.5.1} KRA 3.5.i | **Z** |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable |
| 18.7 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.8 Is effective cooperative management in place for shared wetland systems (for example, in shared river basins and coastal zones)? {3.5.2} KRA 3.5.ii | **Y** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned; Y=Not Relevant |
| 18.8 Additional information (If ‘Yes’ or ‘Partially’, please indicate for which wetland systems such management is in place): | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 18.9 Does your country participate in regional networks or initiatives for wetland-dependent migratory species? {3.5.3} KRA 3.5.iii | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable |
| 18.9 Additional information:  The Kingdom of the Netherlands is a range state for many Caribbean species. It is noted that the Netherlands, through its focal point for the Caribbean Netherlands based on the island of Bonaire:   * Is an active partner in the UNEP Regional Seas Program for the Caribbean, and its legal instrument, the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean (Cartagena Convention), in particular its Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW Protocol). It has been actively involved in the development of a Marine Mammal Action Plan for the Wider Caribbean, adopted by the Parties to the SPAW Protocol in 2009. In September 2015, the Dutch State Secretary of Economic Affairs declared the Yarari Marine Mammal and Shark Sanctuary around the islands of Bonaire and Saba (see <http://www.dcnanature.org/yarari-sanctuary-established/>). This sanctuary will form part of a network of marine mammal sanctuaries in the region, including the Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary (USA), the Agoa Sanctuary (French Caribbean) and the Dominican Republic Marine Mammal Sanctuary, which includes the Silver Banks. * Noting the scarcity of CMS Parties in the Caribbean region, is actively engaging with the Western Hemisphere Migratory Species Initiative (WHMSI) which is uniting and supporting various initiatives for the conservation of migratory birds in the Americas such as the Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network, and the Society for the Conservation and Study of Caribbean Birds as well as initiatives for the conservation of other migratory species such as sea turtles, bats, and marine mammals. * Actively participates in the Inter-American Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles (IAC) and hosted the IAC's 5th Conference of Parties on Bonaire; * Engages with the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI); and * Participates in the Ramsar Wetlands Caribbean Initiative. | |

## *Target 19. Capacity building for implementation of the Convention and the 4th Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 – 2024 is enhanced.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **COP13 REPORT** | |
| 19.1 Has an assessment of national and local training needs for the implementation of the Convention been made? {4.1.4} KRAs 4.1.iv & 4.1.viii | **B** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 19.1 Additional information: | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 19.2 Are wetland conservation and wise-use issues included in formal education programmes}. | **C** |
| A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned |
| 19. 2 Additional information: If you answer yes to the above please provide information on which mechanisms and materials  The extent to which wetland conservation and wise-use issues are part of formal education programs differs between the different islands:   * The parks and conservation organizations of the Dutch Caribbean have developed nature education materials for youth in different age-classes (see <http://www.dcnanature.org/resources/nature-education/>). * The management organization for the Ramsar Sites on Bonaire has a general nature education program and awareness activities which includes information on the Ramsar sites and other wetlands. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 19.3 How many opportunities for wetland site manager training have been provided since COP12? {4.1.5} KRA 4.1.iv  a) at Ramsar Sites  b) at other wetlands | 1. E=0 2. G= more than 2 |
| E=# opportunities; F=Less than #; G= More than #; C= Partially; X= Unknown; Y=Not Relevant |
| 19.3 Additional information (including whether the Ramsar Wise Use Handbooks were used in the training):  A complete overview is not available but workshops and trainings are regularly provided, like:   * The Caribbean Waterbird Census (CWC) Workshop was held on 13th – 16th January 2015 at the Carmabi Foundation Science Center (Curacao). This workshop was part of an initiative being led by BirdsCaribbean (formerly SCSCB) aiming to build capacity for waterbird and wetland conservation in the region. * In November 2017 STINAPA staff participated in a workshop customer service: <http://stinapabonaire.org/stinapa_news/stinapa-staff-participated-workshop-customer-service/> | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 19.4 Have you (AA) used your previous Ramsar National Reports in monitoring implementation of the Convention? {4.3.1} KRA 4.3.ii | **A** |
| A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned; Z=Not Applicable |
| 19.4 Additional information (If ‘Yes’, please indicate how the Reports have been used for monitoring): | |

# Section 4. Optional annex to allow any Contracting Party that has developed national targets to provide information on those

# Goal 1. Addressing the drivers of wetland loss and degradation

## *Target 1. Wetland benefits are featured in national/ local policy strategies and plans relating to key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture, fisheries at the national and local level. Contributes to Aichi Target 2*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Planning of National Targets | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information: |

## *Target 2. Water use respects wetland ecosystem needs for them to fulfil their functions and provide services at the appropriate scale inter alia at the basin level or along a coastal zone. Contributes to Aichi Targets 7 and 8 and Sustainable Development Goal 6.3.1*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning of National Targets** | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information: |

## *Target 3. Public and private sectors have increased their efforts to apply guidelines and good practices for the wise use of water and wetlands.* {1.10}. Contributes to Aichi Targets 3, 4, 7 and 8.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning of National Targets** | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information: |

## *Target 4. Invasive alien species and pathways of introduction and expansion are identified and prioritized, priority invasive alien species are controlled or eradicated, and management responses are prepared and implemented to prevent their introduction and establishment. Contributes to Aichi Target 9.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning of National Targets** | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information: |

# Goal 2. Effectively conserving and managing the Ramsar Site network

## *Target 5. The ecological character of Ramsar Sites is maintained or restored through effective, planning and integrated management {2.1.}. Contributes to Aichi Target 6,11, 12.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning of National Targets** | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information: |

## *Target 7.* *Sites that are at risk of change of ecological character have threats addressed {2.6.}. Contributes to Aichi Targets 5, 7, 11, 12*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning of National Targets** | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information: |

# Goal 3. Wisely Using All Wetlands

## *Target 8.* *National wetland inventories have been either initiated, completed or updated and disseminated and used for promoting the conservation and effective management of all wetlands {1.1.1} KRA 1.1.i. Contrubutes to Aichi Targets 12, 14, 18, 19.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Planning of National Targets | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information: |

## *Target 9. The wise use of wetlands is strengthened through integrated resource management at the appropriate scale, inter alia, within a river basin or along a coastal zone {1.3.}. Contributes to Aichi Targets 4, 6, 7.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning of National Targets** | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answe*r* |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information: |

## *Target 10. The traditional knowledge innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities relevant for the wise use of wetlands and their customary use of wetland resources, are documented, respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with a full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities at all relevant levels. Contributes to Aichi Target 18.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning of National Targets** | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information: |

## *Target 11. Wetland functions, services and benefits are widely demonstrated, documented and disseminated. {1.4.}. Contributes to Aichi Targets 1, 2, 13, 14.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning of National Targets** | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  |  |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information |

## *Target 12. Restoration is in progress in degraded wetlands, with priority to wetlands that are relevant for biodiversity conservation, disaster risk reduction, livelihoods and/or climate change mitigation and adaptation. {1.8.}. Contributes to Aichi Targets 14 and 15.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning of National Targets** | | |
| **Priority of the target :** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

## *Target 13. Enhanced sustainability of key sectors such as water, energy, mining, agriculture, tourism, urban development, infrastructure, industry, forestry, aquaculture and fisheries when they affect wetlands, contributing to biodiversity conservation and human livelihoods. Contributes to Aichi Targets 6 and 7.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning of National Targets** | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information |

# GOAL 4. enhancing implementation

## *Target 15. Ramsar Regional Initiatives with the active involvement and support of the Parties in each region are reinforced and developed into effective tools to assist in the full implementation of the Convention. {3.2.}*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning of National Targets** | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information |

## *Target 16*. *Wetlands conservation and wise use are mainstreamed through communication, capacity development, education, participation and awareness {4.1}. Contributes to Aichi Target 1 and 18.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning of National Targets** | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information |

## *Target 17.* *Financial and other resources for effectively implementing the fourth Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 – 2024 from all sources are made available. {4.2.}. Contributes to Aichi Target 20.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning of National Targets** | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information |

## *Target 18. International cooperation is strengthened at all levels {3.1}*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning of National Targets** | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information |

## *Target 19. Capacity building for implementation of the Convention and the 4th Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 – 2024 is enhanced. Contributes to Aichi Targets 1 and 17.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning of National Targets** | | |
| **Priority of the target:** |  | A= High; B= Medium; C= Low; D= Not relevant; E= No answer |
| **Resourcing:** |  | A= Good; B= Adequate; C= Limiting; D= Severely limiting; E= No answer |
| **National Targets (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Planned Activities  (Text Answer):** |  | |
| **Outcomes achieved by 2018 and how they contribute to achievement of the Aichi Targets and Sustainable Development Goals**  **Note: this field has to be completed when the full report is submitted in January 2018** |  | |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional information |

# Section 5: Optional annex to enable Contracting Parties to provide additional voluntary information on designated Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Sites)

**Guidance for filling in this section**

1. Contracting Parties can opt to provide additional information specific to any or all of their designated Ramsar Sites.
2. The only indicator questions included in this section are those from Section 3 of the COP13 NRF which directly concern Ramsar Sites.
3. In some cases, to make them meaningful in the context of reporting on each Ramsar Site separately, some of these indicator questions and/or their answer options have been adjusted from their formulation in Section 3 of the COP13 NRF.
4. Please include information on only one site in each row. In the appropriate columns please add the name and official site number (from the [Ramsar Sites Information Service](http://ramsar.wetlands.org)).
5. For each ‘indicator question’, please select one answer from the legend.
6. A final column of this Annex is provided as a ‘free text’ box for the inclusion of any additional information concerning the Ramsar Site.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of Contracting Party:** |  |

**List of indicator questions:**

**5.7** Has a cross-sectoral site management committee been established for the site?

**5.9** If an assessment of the effectiveness of Ramsar Site management has been made please indicate the year of assessment, which assessment tool did you use (e.g. METT, Resolution XII.15), the result (score) of the assessment and the source of the information in the box for additional information.

**11.1**  Has an assessment been made of the ecosystem benefits/services provided by the Ramsar Site?

**11.3** Have socio-economic values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

**11.4** Have cultural values of wetlands been included in the management planning for the Ramsar Site?

**16.3a** Is stakeholder participation in decision-making promoted, especially with local stakeholder involvement in the management of the Ramsar Site?

**16.6a** Have communication mechanisms been established to share information between the Ramsar Administrative Authority and the Ramsar Site manager(s)?

| **Ramsar Site number** | **Ramsar Site name** | **5.7**  **➀** | **5.9**  **➀** | **11.1**  **➂** | **11.3**  **➃** | **11.4**  **➃** | **16.3a**  **➀** | **16.6a**  **➀** | **Any additional comments/information about the site** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* A=Yes; B=No; D=Planned
* A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; D=Planned
* A=Yes; B=No; C=Partially; Z=No Management Plan
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